COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. VI. No. 26.] LONDON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1804. [PRICE 1OD.

"*In short, it appears by no means improbable, that, when the nation shall become heartily* "*weary of this lingering war, and when to that weariness shall be added the discontent arising* "*from the high price of provisions, we shall be transferred again to the care of the Addingtons, who, whatever may be thought to the contrary, will never be found in an opposition* "*to the present ministry.*"—POLITICAL REGISTER, 18th August, 1804.

TO THE READER.

Owing to an error of the PRINTER, the preceding sheet was *paged* wrong. It begins with p, 995, instead of 961; so that there is, in the paging, a chasm of 34 pages. This erratum is thus conspicuously inserted to prevent the trouble which readers might otherwise experience from supposing there to be a chasm in the work.

PRINCESS CHARLOTTE OF WALES.

This subject, notwithstanding the extreme delicacy of it, continues to be forced forward by the ministerial prints, and, in some instances, in a manner that it would be almost criminal not to animadvert upon. As was before observed, great pains have been taken to prepossess the public mind; to commit the people on the side of the minister; but, it was hardly to be imagined, that there would have appeared publications of so indecent a nature as that of the following one, taken from the ministerial paper, THE OBSERVER, of the 23d instant.—"A "question respecting the guardianship of "the Princess Charlotte, has very *indecorously* "become the subject of newspaper discussion.—The high respect and duty which "we owe to all the parties at issue, makes "us lament the existence of any difference "amongst them, or that their private feelings and conduct should be exposed to "the rude arbitrament of public opinion. "The desire of each is unquestionably the "happiness and advantage of the innocent "and interesting object of contention: the "disposition and obligation to discharge the "important duty claimed by each, is, no "doubt, alike in all, and the question thus "becomes narrowed to the consideration of "who is legally entitled to a preference.—"Lord Thurlow, and other high authorities, are stated to have declared that the "law, strengthened by recent precedents, "decidedly places this illustrious infant under the immediate guardianship of his "Majesty, who, it is added, is induced to "press his right by an apprehension that if "her Royal Highness remains under her "*present control*, she may ultimately become "subject to, and *contaminated* by, the same "calamitous ascendency which has been so "fatal to the happiness of her parents. But "it, surely, cannot become a question "*whether the amiable Princess of Wales or* "*Mrs. Fitzherbert is the most eligible preceptress* "*of the infant Princess*; nor can we for an instant question the solicitude of the Prince "to guard the religion and the *virtue* of his "child from the influence of *an example* "*hostile to both.* We must, therefore, refer "the matter to the question of law, and "content ourselves with the hope, that the "decision will be marked by equity, and "contribute to the advantage of the Royal "Infant, whose happiness now so powerfully interests the empire, and whose conduct "may influence its destinies."* ——The *decorousness* of this writer will, doubtless, need no illustration! The pressing of Lord Thurlow into the service is most scandalously impudent; but, this is an earnest of what we may expect; it is a pretty strong assurance, that the prints on that side are determined to stick at nothing. The apprehension, by no means equivocally expressed, that, if, the Princess Charlotte of Wales remain under the control of her Royal Father, she will become "*contaminated*," is something so outrageous that words cannot be found sufficiently strong to express a proper degree of abhorrence at it. The question, as stated in the next sentence, is a gross and shameful misrepresentation of the fact, and of this it is hardly possible that the writer could have

* The party to which this print belongs is sufficiently indicated in the following paragraph, which stands immediately below the one above quoted:—"Lord Melville, "according to the rumours of the day, is to "succeed Lord Harrowby at the foreign office; the reported change is imputed to an "apprehension that his lordship's health is "such as will not, for some time, admit of "his resuming the important duties of his "station. Lord Melville, from his intelligence, activity, and official habits, *would* "*do honour to any department*, but the Admiralty is, perhaps, that which, of all others, "most requires his attention and superintendence."

been ignorant.——Leaving this publication to that general abhorrence, which it so well merits, and which, I trust, it will meet with, I shall now lay before my readers those opinions of the twelve Judges upon this subject, which opinions were alluded to in the preceding sheet of this work ——Before I do this, however, there are two points upon which it appears necessary to say a few words. The first relates to the *origin* of the proposed measure. The ministerial writers, for reasons too evident to need stating, choose to represent the desire of withdrawing the infant Princess from the care of her Royal Father as having originated *with His Majesty*. This is their constant practice, when they have to defend any measure, the defence of which they find difficult. Every one must remember how liberally they blamed the King for the obstacles which were thrown in the way of the forming of a broad administration in the month of May last; though, since that time, they have congratulated the country, that such an administration was *not* formed. But, if there be, in our constitution, one maxim more indisputable than any other, it is, that the King *can do no wrong*. Out of this maxim arises another not less indisputable; to wit; that the King's minister is responsible for every measure adopted and enforced in the King's name. It is this, indeed, and this alone, that constitutes the essential difference between an absolute, and a limited monarchy: there being, in the former, no responsibility at all. The application is too evident to need pointing out: but, the proposed measure is, even in form, a measure of the cabinet; it cannot be otherwise regarded; and, therefore, the attempts that have been made, by the ministerial prints, to represent it as arising *solely* from the desire or will of the King, is, to say the least of it, daringly unconstitutional...—The other point relates to the *competence of the twelve Judges* in this case. They certainly were fully competent to advise His Majesty King George I. to give him their opinion as to any question of law; but, I repeat, that such opinion, so given, is *not law*; and, as there was a difference of opinion amongst the Judges themselves, we are to judge between them according to the arguments advanced by each side respectively. The opinion submitted to the King by the *ten* Judges was accompanied with no argument or authority in support of it; that of the *two* was, as will be seen, accompanied with very cogent arguments. In the chamber conference, however, *all* the Judges spoke upon the subject; and, by one of the *ten*, Mr. Baron FORTESQUE ALAND, a report of all the speeches has been given. It would be quite useless to copy the whole of them; but, it would not be fair to lay before the public the arguments of the two dissentient Judges, without, at the same time, laying before them that of Mr. Baron FORTESQUE ALAND, whose speech, having been written out at leisure by himself, contains, as may be readily conceived, every argument of any weight, in favour of the claim of the King.——Of FORTESQUE ALAND's accuracy in point of historical statement, there is a pretty good specimen in his argument drawn from the articles of impeachment against the Duke of Suffolk, in the 28th year of Henry VI. He says, that the Prince of Wales was "then living;" but, any one may satisfy himself, that the Prince of Wales was *not born* till between three and four years after the impeachment of Suffolk.——As a specimen of the arguments advanced by the other nine concurring Judges, take that of Mr. Baron MONTAGUE, who had found, "in the sole patent for the *making of cards*, "that the King was called *parens patriæ*, "*et custos regni, et pater-familias totius regni*;" and hence he concluded, that the King had the authority of a *father* over the children of the Prince of Wales! How desperate must have been the case, in support of which an argument like this was seriously urged!—— But, the ten Judges, do indeed, by the mouth of FORTESQUE ALAND, completely stultify themselves at the very out-set, by declaring, that the question, upon which they are called on to decide, "is *too great* to be go- "verned by the *narrow rules of private pro-* "*perty*;" that is to say, that it is *not* a question of *law*, but a great question of *state*; and, of course, that they, as the twelve Judges of England, were no more competent to decide it than any other twelve men, and, perhaps, less competent than any other twelve men of sense and learning.—With these few introductory observations, I should now leave the reader to the perusal of the documents themselves; but, an expression or two that has dropped, in some of the public prints, relative to the state of *dependence*, in which the Judges appear to be supposed to be held, at the epoch referred to, demands a few words. The advocates of the minister and of his proposed measure, seem willing to concede to us, that the Judges of England were not so independent of the King (or rather of the minister) in the reign of George I. as they are at this time; but truth will not suffer us to accept of the concession. We have been taught to repeat by rote, that his present Majesty, upon coming to the throne, released the Judges

rom their dependent state. The phrase is, "that he nobly resolved to render the Judges "independent even of himself." The measure, be it what it would, was the minister's, and not the King's; and, I think, it will be found, that it was by no means such as to merit the pompous eulogia that have been bestowed on it. Nothing is more common than to hear people say, and, indeed, it is generally believed, that, until his present Majesty came to the throne, the Judges held their commissions *during pleasure*. This is, nevertheless, a gross error. Previous to 13 William III. the commissions of the Judges were held during pleasure; but, *then* it was that the tenure was changed; and it was enacted, that they should in future hold their commissions *during good behaviour*, just as they hold them to this day. The alteration which was made in the 1st year of the present reign, as to these commissions, was simply this: the Judges' commissions, like all other commissions, ceased with the demise of the Crown, and, of course, the successor could refuse to renew them, if he thought proper. The prerogative, however, never had, I believe, been exercised in this ungracious way: his Majesty, upon coming to the throne, had renewed the commissions granted by his Royal Grandfather: if, therefore, the new law was effective in any way whatever, its effect could not be to render the Judges more independent *of himself* than they were before, and the only purpose it could possibly answer seems to be that of rendering his Judges more independent than they otherwise would have been *of his successor*.——Whether the new regulation were a wise one, or not; whether it were better calculated for the obtaining of transient ministerial popularity, than for perpetuating the principles and securing the permanent interests of the monarchy, are questions which we are not called upon now to discuss; it being quite enough for our present purpose to have shown, that, at the time when the question relative to the King's right of custody and education of the children of the Heir Apparent was submitted to the twelve Judges, those Judges were just as independent of the King, as the twelve Judges of this day are of his present Majesty.

OPINION OF THE JUDGES UPON THE QUESTION HEREAFTER STATED, AND WHICH QUESTION WAS SUBMITTED TO THEM IN THE REIGN OF GEORGE I, AND ON THE 22D OF JANUARY, 1717.

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.—"May it please your Majesty.—In humble obedience to your Majesty's commands, signified to us by the right honourable the Lord Chancellor, requiring the opinion of all your Majesty's Judges upon the following question, viz. "Whether the education and "the care of the persons of his Majesty's "grand children now in England, and of "Prince Frederick, eldest son of his Royal "Highness the Prince of Wales, when his "Majesty shall think fit to cause him to "come into England, and the ordering the "place of their abode, and appointing their "governors and governesses, and other in-"structors, attendants, and servants, and the "care and approbation of their marriages, "when grown up, belongs of right to his "Majesty as King of this Realm, or not?"——We whose names are hereunto subscribed, being ten of your Majesty's Judges, together with the other two Judges, having taken the same into consideration, and after the most diligent search that we could in this time make into acts and proceedings of Parliament, treaties, public instruments and records, histories and law books, and consideration of the powers and prerogatives which from time to time, in very many instances, have been exercised and owned to belong to your Majesty's royal ancestors and predecessors, with relation to the marriages and care of the persons of the branches of the Royal Family, and of the great concern of the whole kingdom in so important a trust, and after having, pursuant to your Majesty's farther command, signified in like manner to us, heard a learned Serjeant at Law, who, by the command of his Royal Highness, laid before us several things relating to the question aforesaid; and after conferences and deliberations upon all the matters aforesaid, and what occurred to us and the other Judges thereupon, we are humbly of opinion, that the education and the care of the persons of your Majesty's grand children now in England, and of Prince Frederick, eldest son of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, when your Majesty shall think fit to cause him to come into England, and the ordering the place of their abode, and appointing their governors and their governesses, and other instructors, attendants and servants, and the care and approbation of their marriages when grown up, do belong of right to your Majesty, as King of this realm.—All which we most humbly submit to your Royal Majesty's great wisdom.

(Signed) PARKER. R. TRACY.
P. KING. R. DORMER.
T. BURY. J. PRATT.
L. BOWYS. J. MONTAGUE.
J. BLENCOE. FORTESCUE, A."

MR. BARON PRICE AND MR. JUSTICE EYRE'S OPINION UPON THE PRINCE'S CASE, FEB. 1, 1717.

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.—"May it please your Majesty.—In humble obedience to your Majesty's commands, signified to your Judges by the right honourable the Lord Chancellor, we have taken into consideration the following question (*as given above*).—And we are humbly of opinion, that the education and care of the persons of your Majesty's grand children, the ordering the place of their abode, and appointing their governors, governesses and other instructors, attendants, and servants, belong to the Prince, their father. But that the care and approbation of their marriages when grown up, belongs to your Majesty, as King of this realm.—This, Sire, is our humble opinion, but when we acquaint your Majesty that the care and approbation of the marriages of your grand children belong to your Majesty as King of this realm, we desire to be understood as speaking of a care and approbation not exclusive of the Prince their father. But as your Majesty's care will be always employed for the good of the Royal Family and the welfare of your people, so it is a duty incumbent upon every member of the Royal Family to apply to your Majesty, and receive your royal approbation upon every occasion of this kind, for we find that all negotiations of marriages in the Royal Family, have been carried on by the intervention of the Crown, and such marriages as have been contracted without the royal consent and approbation, have been thought contempts of the regal authority; but we find no instance where a marriage has been treated by the Crown for any person of the Royal Family, without the consent of the father, and we beg leave to assure your Majesty that there is no one expression in any of our law books that warrants any such assertion.—As to the other part of the question, in answer to which we cannot concur with the other Judges, it is our duty humbly to lay before your Majesty, that in our opinion the father hath in all cases a right to the custody and education of his children, and this we take to be clear from the general rule of the law.—This right of the father, is said in our books to be founded *jure naturæ*, and to be annexed by nature to the person of the father. In case of younger children it never was disputed, and in regard to the eldest son or daughter, and heir, to whom lands descended from a collateral ancestor, the right of the father obtained even against the Lord, though his seigneurial right to the wardship of his tenant during the minority, prevailed against the grandfather, and all other ancestors lineal and collateral. Littleton, Coke, and Vaughan, all agree that none can have the custody of a man's son, and heir apparent from the father, and in the common case of a tenure in soccage, even the mother has the right of guardianship after the death of the father, preferable to the grandfather. From hence we take it to be the general rule of the law, that the guardianship of the children is a right common to every subject in this kingdom who is a father, without exception.—Upon the best search we have been able to make, we can find but two books written by English lawyers, that can possibly induce a contrary opinion (Bracton and Fleta). Bracton, treating *de patria potestate*, says, *Qui ex filio tuo et ejus uxore nascitur, i. e. nepos tuus et neptis, æque in tua potestate sunt, et pronepos et proneptes, et deinceps cæteri;* and, *in potestate patrum sunt filii qui nascuntur in justo et legitimo matrimonio, idem in nepotibus et pronepotibus, quantum ad avos et proavos paternos;* which Fleta has also said in almost the same words, and which both have taken from Justinian's Institutes. This shews it to have been a part of the Roman law, but it neither is, nor as we conceive ever was, a part of the law of England. It is well known that Bracton and Fleta wrote their several treatises upon the plan of the Imperial laws, and it is as well known that those laws never obtained here, through the general aversion this nation (always zealous of its liberties), had towards them, and accordingly, wherever these writers differ from our year books and authentic reports, they are not allowed to be of authority. And as to this part of the Roman law in particular, which relates to the *patria potestas*, it is acknowledged by all, even by Justinian himself, that it was so peculiar to the Romans, that it never obtained among any other people whatsoever. *Jus autem potestatis, quod in liberos habemus, proprium est civium Romanorum; nulli enim sunt homines, qui talem in liberos habeant potestatem, qualem nos habemus.*—But to give a more particular answer to these passages, which are the only ones that have the least appearance of law, it is evident they cannot be made to affect the case of the Royal Family by any other construction than what will equally affect every other family in England. But that from these passages nothing can be concluded to determine the extent of the *patria potestas* in any family here, is clear from the reason on which the power of the grandfather among the Romans is founded.—Now the reason of the Roman law why children should not be in the power of the father, but of the grandfather ex-

clusive of the father was, because the father himself was not *sui juris*, and in his power, but in *patris familias sui manet potestate, mancipioque*; which are the words of the law of the twelve tables; and it was manifestly absurd, that he should have others in his power, who was not in his own.—This servile condition of the son to the father, which had ordinarily no end, till the father himself was pleased, by emancipation, to put an end to it, being the sole foundation of the grandfather's right to the grand children, as well as to every thing else the father was possessed of; when this state of the father ceased, the power of the grandfather necessarily ceased with it. And so it is declared in Justinian's Institutes, that if the son was emancipated and set free from the power of his father, the children begotten after such emancipation are not in the power of the grandfather, but of the father.—*Quod si post emancipationem conceptus fuerit, patris sui emancipati potestati subjicitur.*—But not to insist that by the laws of England no father has such a power over his children, even in their minority, as the Roman law gave, it is undeniable that with us marriage hath the nature of a true and proper emancipation of the person of the son, and by consequence, even upon the grounds of the Roman law, the grandfather with us can have no right to the children of the son, but the father only. If, therefore, nothing otherwise appears to distinguish the case of the Royal Family, there can be no foundation upon which any prerogative can be established in the instance now in question, and we humbly apprehend that the only precedents which can be alleged to support such a prerogative, when considered, will not be found sufficient. —The first, in the 22d Henry the Third, entitled in Rymer, *de Alianora filia Galfridi*, &c. is only a declaration under the Great Seal that Wm. Talbot had surrendered to King Henry the Third, the Castle of Gloucester, *et Alianorum consanguineam suam sanamet incolumen.*—What can be inferred from hence is hard to determine any farther than that this Alianor was in ward to the Crown, and had been committed to the care of Talbot, who had surrendered her and her estate safe again to the King.—The other precedent, which is in the 11th of Henry the Fourth, is a grant of annual sum of 500 marks to the Prince of Wales for the expense of the maintenance of Edmund, Earl of March, and his brother, so long as they should remain in the Prince's custody, to whom they had been committed the February before. As to this it appears by the history and records of those times that Roger de Mortimer, their father, was killed in Ireland 22 R. 2, and that their mother soon after married Sir Edward Charlton, Lord Powis, and died 7 Henry 4, so that the eldest son was then in ward to the Crown, by reason of his lands held of the Crown, as were his lordships of Wigmore and Clare *inter alia*; and his brother Roger was then an infant of very tender age, and under the care of the King as next relation; and it appears that he died very young; in which latter case we humbly conceive that the care which the King was pleased to take of an infant and orphan so nearly related to him, will not be a precedent to establish a power to the Crown to dispose of the custody of a child while the father is living.—If any stress can be laid upon printed history, the case of Richard, son to Edward the Black Prince, will be an instance against this power, supposed to be lodged by law in the grandfather. He being a minor, lived with his father as part of his family, and his father appointed his governor, of which we have this relation in Hollingshead; that Sir Simon Burlie, kinsman to Dr. Burlie, one of the instructors of Edward the Black Prince, having been admitted among other young gentlemen to be schoolfellow with the Prince, he grew in such credit and favour with him, that afterwards, when his son, Richard of Bourdeaux, was born, the Prince, for special trust and confidence which he had in the said Simon Burlie, committed the governance and education of his son Richard to him; and, after the death of the Black Prince, it appears by two very remarkable instances in our history, that Richard continued with his mother till the death of his grandfather, King Edward the Third.—The younger children of Edward the Fourth lived with their mother, whose wardship she declared she claimed by the advice of learned counsel, according to the relation given us by Sir Thomas More, afterwards Lord Chancellor of England, in his history of those times. Nor was it then pretended that the King had any right to their education, or the care of their persons; and although the Queen was prevailed upon to part with her son, Richard Duke of York, her daughters remained in her custody till she herself was contented to send them to court.—As to the education of their late Majesties, Queen Mary and Queen Anne, during their minorities, it does not appear to us that their uncle, King Charles the Second, appointed their governesses and servants, or any one person that attended them; and we are not enough acquainted with the circumstances of the Duke of Gloucester's case to make the proper remarks, but

seems to have been by agreement with the King: and we humbly conceive that the motion in Parliament, 13th Dec. 1699, for an address to the King to remove the then Bishop of Salisbury (Gilbert Burnet, D.D.) from being his preceptor, can be of no weight in this matter, since it passed in the negative.—It is possible that something may be inferred in favour of this prerogative, from that article of the treaty said to be made by King James I. concerning the match with Spain, which related to the nurture and education of the children of that marriage. It is not to the present question to consider, whether there ever was such a treaty as is related by Rushworth or not. It is certain that it is not to be found upon record, the proper evidence of all public treaties. The articles of the treaty are said in Rushworth to be styled by the cardinals, Proposition for the right Augmentation and Weal of the Roman Catholic Religion. And, in truth, almost every article is so derogatory to the supremacy of the Crown and the statutes made for the establishment and security of the church of England, that it could have carried no sort of authority with it in point of law, even though it had appeared in a regular manner under the Great Seal, and not from the report of historians only. Nor can the oath said to be taken by Prince Charles, while in Spain, to intercede with his father, that the ten years of the education of the children which should be born of his marriage with the Infanta, accorded in one of the articles of this treaty, might be lengthened to the term of twelve years, as the Prince desired, be looked upon as a precedent to determine what the law of England is The right to the care and education of the children of that marriage, had it taken effect, was not then in dispute, and had it been so, nothing can be concluded from the voluntary engagement of the Prince, in favour of a marriage so much desired by himself as well as by his father, wherein the question of this right was never the subject of debate.—There was indeed an article in the treaty with France upon the marriage of King Charles the First with Princess Henrietta Maria, whereby it was agreed that the children of that marriage should be brought up with their mother till their age of thirteen, but it is evident that treaty was made with King Charles the First after his accession to the Crown, and not with King James his father. King James, it is true, sent over the Earls of Carlisle and Holland to treat of that match, but the treaty was not concluded till after his death, and then by powers from King Charles the First, whose stipulations for the education of his own children could need no assistance from his prerogative.—Thus have we humbly laid before your Majesty what we have to offer in relation to the books and precedents that have fallen under our consideration upon this head, which we cannot think sufficient to infer a prerogative in your Majesty as King of this realm, in the care and education of your Majesty's grandchildren during the life, and without the consent, of their father; a prerogative, as we humbly apprehend, hitherto unknown to the laws of England.—All which is most humbly submitted to your Majesty's great wisdom.

(Signed) "ROBERT PRICE,
"R. EYRE."

SPEECH OF MR. BARON FORTESCUE ALAND, *as delivered during the conference in the Judges' Chamber, and as reported by himself.*

MY LORDS,——This is a question of great importance to the whole kingdom, and I am content, for the better discussing it, to divide it into two parts, because it has been so done by some of my brothers, though I should have thought, that if the King has the marriage of his grandchildren, of necessary consequence he had their education too.——I will then consider, first, whether the King has the care and approbation of the marriage of Prince Frederic and his other grand children, and whether of right it belongs to his Majesty, as King of this Realm, or not.——This subject, touching the power of a grandfather, may be treated of either as a public or a private right. It has been treated of pretty much as a private right by the two Judges that differ, and by the Counsel for the Prince of Wales, which I think is an error in the foundation of their argument. For it ought manifestly to be treated as *jus publicum*, such a right as our law books express it to be *quod ad statem rei publicæ spectat*, and that makes it the King's prerogative, and that is the King's inheritance, as King of this realm, which is too great a point to be governed by the narrow rules of private property. Now, to treat this otherwise is injurious to the Prince himself, and all his children. Our law books say he is esteemed as one nearest to the King. So it has been determined in full Parliament, in the case of the Prince of Wales in Henry VI.'s time. And in his patent, which was made by authority of Parliament in 33 Henry VI. the introduction of the patent is *ut ipsum, qui reputatione juris censetur eadem persona nobiscum, digno preveniamus honore, &c.* So that in the

eye of the law they are to be reckoned but as one person.——It is, for the same reason, that an Act of Parliament which relates to the Prince, is a public law of which every body is to take notice, because, whatever concerns the Prince, concerns the King; and whatever concerns the King concerns every subject in England. The act, therefore, which relates to the Duchy of Cornwall, has been held to be a public law. Now, let us see what is said in my Lord Coke's 8 Rep. called The Prince's Case. Speaking of the Prince, it is said—*corruscat radiis Reges patris, et censetur una persona cum ipso Rege.* So says Lord Hobart, who was the Prince's Chancellor, Hob. Rep. 226.——It is for the same reason that it was high treason by the common law of England (before any statute) to compass and imagine the death of the King's eldest son and heir, who is generally made Prince of Wales, though now born Duke of Cornwall (but is not so of a collateral heir to the Crown) and this offence is called *crimen læsæ Majestatis*—a crime that hurts the Majesty of the King himself. It follows then, that as they are but one person in law, so in point of law they are supposed to have but one will in relation to the education, marriage, and management of the grandchildren. And the Prince of Wales, in point of law, is supposed in every thing to concur with his Majesty, which quite subverts and destroys the distinction in common persons of grandfather, father, and son.—— Now, the King, as he is *Parens Patriæ*, he is also *Parens Nepotum*, parent of his grandchildren, as Lord Coke expounds the King's nephew to signify his grandson, also from the Latin *nepos* which signifies both. So in the case of a Queen consort, she is the first wife in the kingdom; Queen, in the Saxon language, signifying wife. And, therefore, by reason of excellence, it was the name for the King's wife, who, consider her in her private capacity, as the private wife of a common subject, she cannot sue or be sued herself, nor can grant to or from her husband; but, then consider her in her public character and capacity as a Queen, she can sue and be sued by herself, and make grants to and from the King her husband, by her prerogative, and anciently she had a great many. Now, I think, in this case, much may be argued from the names and appellations of the children of the Royal Family. In history they are called the Children of England, and all of them born Princes and Princesses of England, before they had any title, and all of them Kings and Queens, *in potentia*, and may one day reign over us. Seldon calls them Heirs Apparent of England, and they are called so in the Parliament Rolls. This agrees with the most early times in our kingdom; for, till Henry the First's time they were distingoished from all other persons, by calling both the eldest and the rest of the King's sons Clito and Clitones, and they had no other titles. Now, Clito is a Latin word, which comes from the Greek word κλειτος, which signifies Inclytus,—most noble and famous. So the word Ætheling, as Edgar Ætheling, who was not the King's son, but his great nephew, from the Saxon word *Ethel nobilis*; which shews that all the Royal Family were called by the same name as the King's sons; and so sets out the admirable union of the Royal Family.—The first son of the King is called Prince of England, before any creation: so it is in Scotland. Before the Union, he was called Prince of Scotland; and so (says Mr. Seldon) it is in other nations: as in France the Duke of Orleans, Regent of France, was called *Petit Fitz de France*—Grandson of France, not Grandson to the King. So Henrietta Maria, in the marriage articles with Charles the First, was called *Fille de France*, daughter of France, and not daughter of the King. Having then made it appear, I think clearly, that all the children and grandchildren of the Royal Family are public persons and Princes of the nation, and the Prince of Wales himself one and the same person with the King; it follows manifestly, as a just corollary and consequence, that the King who has the executive power in him, is to have the care and command in the marriages of these children for the good of the whole nation. It is part of that original trust, which, by the constitution of our government, is reposed in the King for the security of his people. And as this is a prerogative vested in the crown in the reason of the law and nature of a monarchy, so in all ages the Crown has practised and been in possession of this right. Now, in the point or marriages, there are precedents from the time of H. III. down to this time.— In 28 H. 6. it was one of the articles of impeachment of High Treason against the Duke of Suffolk for attempting only to marry his son to Margaret, the daughter and heir of the Duke of Somerset, who had a right to the Crown after the death of the King without issue, although she was not heir apparent, for there was a Prince of Wales then living. When he came to his trial, he did not deny but it was an offence, but insisted it was not true, for that some of the lords then present knew that he intended to marry his son to the Earl of Warwick's daughter. And this is still the stronger, because this lady was in ward to

him, and so he had a private right in her marriage.——By an Act of Parliament, 28 H. 8. it is made high treason to marry any of the Royal Family. It is thereby enacted, that if any person presume to marry any one of the King's children lawfully born, or otherwise, or commonly reputed, or taken for his children, or grandchildren, without the special leave of the King, he shall be adjudged a traitor to the King and the realm; and thereby it is made high treason in the lady too, being against the King and the realm, which shews clearly that the whole kingdom is concerned.——And though this act is now repealed in a crowd with other acts to bring all treasons to the standard of 25 Edward III. yet it is impossible the Parliament should make that high treason which was no crime at all before, and especially high treason in his own children; nay, when it was lawful before to marry any person of the Royal Family (if the doctrine we are taught be true) and each had a right to marry as they pleased. And, it is observable here that the Parliament makes no difference whether the father be living or not, nor takes any care of that paternal right which is pretended.—In Queen Mary's time, though this offence ceased to be high treason, yet it did not cease to be a crime; for in the year 1558, the King of Sweden sent a message secretly to the Lady Elizabeth, the Queen's half-sister only, afterwards Queen Elizabeth, who was then at Hatfield, to propose marriage to her. But she rejected it with warmth, for this reason, because the proposal came not to her by the Queen's direction. And, upon an excuse made by the King of Sweden, that he first made love as a gentleman of quality to gain her consent, and then he would, as a King, address himself to the Queen in proper form, her answer was, she was to entertain no such propositions unless the Queen sent them to her. Upon this the Queen sent Sir Thomas Pope to the Lady Elizabeth, to let her know she well approved of the answer she had made, and the Lady Elizabeth further declared, she would never see the messenger more, because he had presumed to come to her without the Queen's leave.—So that here is one foreign King and two Queens of England concurring in the same sentiment, which seems strongly to argue, that it is the law of nations, as well as the prerogative of this Crown.——The next instance I shall mention is the case of Lady Arabella, and a law book to support it, and that is the Countess of Shrewsbury's case, 12 Co. 6. in the 10th year of King James the First. The Countess of Shrewsbury was put in prison, and sent for before the Council to answer to a contempt of dangerous consequence, because she refused to answer when examined about Lady Arabella's flight for marrying Mr. Seymour, she being of the Royal Family: and there the Attorney and Solicitor-General of the King, charged it as a crime, that Lady Arabella, being of the Blood Royal, had married Mr. Seymour, second son of the Earl of Hertford, without the King's privity and consent. Now, it appears Seymour was committed to the Tower for this offence, but escaped; and that Lady Arabella was also committed, and she escaped, and was taken flying beyond the sea before she got over.——The first crime charged on the Countess was her abetting the flight of Lady Arabella, her niece, and the immediate crime was not answering in that case. Now, as marrying without the King's leave was no crime, she could never have been accused for not answering to her abetting the flight for such a marriage; so that the marrying without leave was plainly charged as a crime. They both were committed for a crime, and they both fled as for a crime, and it is admitted and taken for granted to be a crime. And her contempt in not answering in the case of marriage in the Royal Family was also resolved to be a crime; and this was done by all the great Ministers of State, and by the Chancellor and two Chief Justices (Fleming and Lord Coke), and Chancellor of the Exchequer and Duchy and Chief Baron, in the fifteenth year of King James I. and in the end she was fined ten thousand pounds and committed to the Tower.——The next case I shall mention is the marriage of the Princess of Modena and the Duke of York. There was an address of the House of Commons to the King to prevent this marriage. The King's answer is very remarkable. "It is completed" (says the King), "but it was with my consent and authority," and the Parliament acquiesced in that answer. Now, this address was absurd if the King had no power to prevent it; so that this amounts to the judgment and opinion of the King and Parliament, that this right was in the crown exclusive of his brother. So here is the King claiming this authority even against his own brother and his private right, and the Parliament confirming it.——Then there is the marriage of the Princess Mary, daughter of the Duke of York, to the Prince of Orange. This match was made entirely by the King's consent, even without the knowledge of the Duke, her father, and against his liking and consent. "The King, speaking to Sir William Temple about this match," says, "If I am not deceived, the Prince of Orange is the ho-

nestest man in the world: therefore, he shall have his wife, and you shall go and tell my brother so, and that it is a thing I am resolved on." The Duke was chagrined a little, but said, "the King shall be obeyed."—Here is a father acknowledging the right to be in the King to marry his own daughter, who was only a collateral relation to the King, and married against the father's will, as every one knows.—In 1683, the match with the Princess Anne, the other daughter of the Duke of York, was made by the King in the same manner, and both these marriages were established by a public declaration of his Majesty to the whole nation.—And thus I beg leave to conclude the instances of marriage, but with this remark, that happy it is for this nation that the King in the two last instances had this prerogative; for had this pretended paternal right then prevailed, the English nation had been for ever undone, and our religion destroyed, and we had never seen the many and great blessings we enjoy and are likely to enjoy by this family sitting on the throne of Great Britain. Thus the nation sees the trace of this happy prerogative from Henry III.'s time to this very day, being the compass of almost 500 years uninterrupted, undisputed, and not one single instance to the contrary.—These instances concerning marriages of the Royal Family being so numerous, and the light so glaring, from histories, records, public acts, statutes, and law books, the two judges who differ could not resist this part of the question, but have retired to the other part, that of the education; though I hope to prove, that if the King has the marriage, he must have the education too. The reason that my Lord Coke gives, why the Queen Dowager cannot marry without the King's leave is, *ne capitalibus inimicis regis magitentur*. Now, the reason for the King's having the wardship of his grand children, and education too, is stronger, viz lest the heir of the crown himself be led aside by ill principles and bad politics, and become himself an enemy to the constitution and to the kingdom. Marriage is one of the main ends of the education; and that education is a principal qualification for that marriage, and therefore can never be so properly placed as with him who has the marriage. Vide 6 H. VI. 2 Inst. p. 18.—Besides, these two powers, if placed in different persons, may clash and be repugnant; for which of them is to determine when the marriage is to begin, and to whom and when the education is to end.—Again if the King has the marriage he has the appointment of the time of that marriage, and consequently he can, at any time, appoint it; and he that can at any time appoint the marriage, can at any time call for the custody of that person; and he that can at any time demand the person out of custody of another, has the entire power over that person.—Again, it is a true and regular argument, and conclusive to say, that whoever has the end must have the means also, otherwise he cannot be said to have the end.—If I have the marriage of any person, I can never be sure of that, unless I have the custody and education of that person. But his Majesty's prerogative in this part of the question relating to the education, is as clearly to be made out, though not by so many instances, as the case of marriage.—When Prince Charles had by surprise got leave of his father to make a journey to Spain, to fetch home his mistress the Infanta, revolving in his mind the hazard of that expedition, and the ill influence it might have on the people. King James then declared that the Prince was looked upon by his people as the son of his kingdom.—Clarendon's History, page 14. And this being related by him, carries with it his authority too, who was a very great lawyer, and chancellor of the realm.—The law books of Bracton and Fleta, which have been quoted, are the ancient law of the land, extending to all cases; but this law being altered only in private cases by usage and statute, it remains law to this day as to the Royal Family; because, as to them this law has had no alteration by any law or statute whatever, and usage has gone accordingly.—These law books are so strong that there has been no way thought of to evade them, but by denying the authority of them and calling it civil law. But, I own I am not a little surprised that these books should be denied for law, when in my little experience, I have known them quoted almost in every argument where pains have been taken, if any thing could be found in those books, to the question in hand; and, I have never known them denied for law but where some statute or usage, time out of mind, has altered them. We have been told, indeed, that they were quoted in the case of ship money. But, I believe, that objection would not have been made if they had been aware that those very books were quoted on both sides of the question, which destroys the objection, and shews that they were approved of by all who argued in that case, both of one side and the other.—But, if it be meant civil law, because it is in force in all civilized nations, I believe that is true, for I take this to be the prerogative of all kings, nor has there been any instance given in any monarchy where the law is otherwise.—Mr. Selden says

the King of England is an Emperor, and this realm an empire, and so called in statutes and records without number; and if so, he will have the prerogative, equal with other kings and emperors, if no statute law or usage say the contrary.——If the prerogative then be the law of nations, that is part of the law of the land, and will give the King a clear title to it. See the Statute of Precedency, which is 32 H. 8, cap. 10. It enacts that no person presume to sit at any side of the Cloth of State, except the King's children. Then when it goes on to place the great officers of state—it says, that being barons, they shall be placed on the left side of the Parliament Chamber, above all dukes, except the King's son, the King's brother, the King's uncle, the King's nephew, (i e. his grandson, or the King's brothers' or sisters' son.)—Now, this shews that the King's son, and the King's nephew, or grandson, is comprehended under the term—King's Children; because the latter is substituted in the place of the former.——17 Edward III. Archbishop of Canterbury came into Parliament and demanded *Si les enfans notre, sen le Roi*, born beyond sea, should inherit in England; because born out of the King's dominions and aliens. And all the Parliament agreed that let them be born where they would, they should inherit.——It would be a jest to imagine that the King's grand-child was not within that law, and within the word *les enfans*, children; and there is the same reason in this case.——Another reason is, that the King's grandson is higher in dignity, because nearer the crown, than any other of the King's sons, except his own father, therefore, ought to be esteemed equal with his own sons; and therefore, if Prince Frederic were here, and the King had other sons besides the Prince, he would take place of all those, as Richard of Bourdeaux's did when his grandfather placed him at a public table above all his own children, who were his uncles.——Pursuant to this notion grand-children of the Crown are styled children in records. There is, 50 Edward III. Richard Prince of Wales, his writ of summons to Parliament is directed thus—*Rex Edwardus carissimo filio meo Ricardo Principi Walliæ.*—So is 51 Edward III. This Prince Richard holds a Parliament by commission from his grandfather, and that runs in the same manner—*De circumspectione et industria magnitudine carissimi filii nostri, Ric. I. Principis Walliæ. Pat. Rot. 51 Ed. III. An.* 41.—Now, I think education is of greater consequence than marriage, both to the person and to the people of England—to the person, because, if bred either in the Popish religion, or if trained up in any other communion, though Protestant, except the Church of England, he is not capable of reigning; and if bred up in arbitrary principles, inconsistent with a limited monarchy, the whole nation will then be in danger: whereas, an ill-chosen match will only be the most uneasy to the Prince that marries, and will little affect the State, so long as the Prince is steady, and adheres to the constitution.——Where is a prince to be educated who is to be bred up a king, but in the Palace and Court of a King, and under his special care and influence?——"The learned Sir John Fortescue, called by Sir Walter Raleigh the bulwark of the law of England, who was Chief Justice and Chancellor, and also tutor to the Prince of Wales in Henry VIth's time, in his Treatise *De Laudibus Legum Anglicæ*, which consists of dialogues betwixt him and the prince about his education, says, that there are two things that a prince who is like to be heir to the crown ought principally to be instructed in, that is martial discipline, and the laws and constitution of England: and where are those to be had but in the King's armies, and among the great officers and ministers of the King?——The same Sir J. Fortescue says, speaking of the King's words in Knight's service, the princes of the realm also holding of the King, must be well educated, since these orphans in their childhood are brought up in the King's house. Therefore, I cannot but greatly commend the riches and magnificence of the King's Court, because it is the supreme school for the nobility of the land, whereby the realm flourishes and is preserved.——There is a patent in the 13th of Edward IV. from the King to the Bishop of Rochester, whereby he was constituted tutor to the Prince and president of the Prince's Council, which is very remarkable. In the preamble it says, "Howbeit every child in his young age ought to he brought up in virtue and knowledge; yet, nevertheless, such persons as God has called to the pre-eminent state of princes, and to succeed their progenitors in the state of regality, ought more singularly to be informed and instructed in knowledge and virtue. We therefore, desiring our dearest son, the prince, perfectly, knowingly, and virtuously to be educated in his youth, and wholly trusting in the truth, wit, knowledge and virtue, and also love and affection, that our Reverend Father hath to us and to our issue, we have committed and deputed him to teach and inform our said son, and also appointed him president of his council, giving him power to assemble all the counsellors of our said son."—Now

what I would observe from this patent is, in the first place, that it shews the great regard that is to be had to all the prince's or king's children, all who are like to succeed to the crown, that they above all others ought most singularly to be educated, and makes no distinction in the education between the first or any other of the princes of the Royal Blood, and the education to be perfect in knowledge and virtue.—— In the next place, it shews the qualification of such tutors, and who is to choose them. ——This does not invade the paternal right, but is consistent with it. It is very probable that a grandson may obey both father and grandfather: nor can it be supposed that the father and grandfather will give contradictory commands without breach of duty in the son; but it ought to be presumed by all reasonable men, that they will both concur in material parts of the education, both for the good of their child and the safety of the kingdom, so that in this concurs the law of God as well as man. For I believe nobody ever yet doubted, but a grandson was within the fifth command, and in obedience to that law the Patriarchs always conformed themselves. But these sticklers for paternal right seem to have forgot the right of the mother, which, by the fifth commandment, is as well established as the right of the father, and some civilians give a superiority to the mother, at least by the law of nature; and, I believe, that nobody ever thought that giving this power to the father excluded the right of the mother. Nor can the supposition that the mother should contradict the command of the father any more destroy the superiority of the husband in the one case, than the same groundless supposition in the son destroy the right of the father in the other case.——But to suppose for once an unreasonable thing, and what will never happen, that there should be contradictory commands, the public good must be preferred, and duty to parents must be always subject to the safety of the whole community; and the King, who is *parens patriæ*, as well as *parens nepotis*, must be obeyed, to whom there is a double obligation by nature and by allegiance, i. e, by the law of God and the law of man.——As to what was said by brother Reynolds, the Prince's Counsel, in relation to the statute of 12 Car. 2, cap. 24. that the Prince was within that Act of Parliament, I deny it to be law, or any thing like it, for then it would be In the power of the Prince to grant or appoint, by deed or will, the guardianship, custody, or tuition of his son to the King of France, the Turk, or any person whatever, which would be in effect to give him a power of disposing of the Crown. And by this learned doctrine the Royal Family might be dispersed all over Europe, and this nominee would be entitled to take the profits of all the lands of such heir to the Crown, and the management of all his estate.——What was said by my brother Eyre as to the Black Prince's disposing of his son's governance, that was a case of absolute necessity, and in the absence of the King in foreign parts, for he was then on his journey to the Holy Land."

CORONATION OF NAPOLEON.

(Concluded from p. 1012)

This, it is, that has consecrated to eternity the epoch of the 9th of November.——It is this, Sire, that brings back and attaches to you such of the republicans whose patriotism was most fervent and zealous. They were confirmed in their hatred against the throne by their attachment to the interests of the people and the ardent desire of the public good. Their ideas have been realised only by your government; out of conceit with their chimera, and brought back by you to the reality, they are well convinced that it was impossible to think seriously of establishing a republic, properly so called, amongst a people, attached to monarchy by their wants, by instinct, and by the force of a habit, which nothing can overcome. Yes, Sire, on this point there is but one sentiment —yet, the government of a single person is to so vast a country what the statue of Pallas was formerly to the Trojans—by being deprived of it their ruin was accelerated.—— But still this is not enough. The unity of the Empire, is, like the bundle of twigs, the aggregate of its power; but, like the twigs of the untied bundle, the parts would soon be disunited and broken, if the hereditary succession to the aggregate did not secure the bond. An order of succession, previously determined, is the firmest support of a monarchical government. So, by the election even which made you Emperor, the senate and the people have deprived themselves of the right of electing in future, as long as those glorious lines shall subsist, to which they transfer the exclusive right to the Empire. It is a great deposit of trust, consecrated by the Law of Nations, the necessity of which has been felt by the nation, in order to relieve itself from guarding against any omission, or the apprehension of troubles in this delegation of its supreme power. ——Amongst the happy results of the law of succession, such as the French have just

adopted, the sagacity of the great people has distinguished two principal advantages; first, that a dynasty raised by liberty, will be faithful to its principle; there is no instance of a river flowing back to its source. Besides, a new source of stability for public credit, both internally and externally, is to be expected from a continued tradition in this paternal and perpetual government. Amongst foreign nations also, upon how much more solid a base will our alliances be supported? It is a community of interests, that constitutes all the bonds of this world: the friends of France being able to rely on her, she can rely on them; and this proud country, reinstated in Europe in the rank, from which weakness had suffered her to fall, will, henceforth, have it in its power to exercise a permanent influence on the repose of the nations, and on the peace of the Continent.——As to our enemies, if they persist in being so, their despair must redouble in contemplating the service they have done us in spite of them. We have been put upon our guard by their atrocious plots. As a last resource they have meditated crimes; it was our duty to render them useless. Thus then, in whatever view our happiness is their work.—But, Sire, until their eyes shall be opened, or our indignant army shall go to punish their perfidy, our happiness constitutes their punishment. What a spectacle for them to behold, France, that same France, which they wished to lacerate, and which they must now know to be united round its august chief, possessing the same spirit, forming the same wishes, and tranquilly celebrating the festivals which announce the union of liberty, that first of all moving principles with this grand conservative system of nations, hereditary monarchy.——It was desired previous to the revolution, that the chief of a great state like France, should promise at his accession, not to be the king of nobles nor of any other class, but the chief of the nation, not to maintain usurped privileges, which in an agricultural country, and amongst an industrious people, would, nevertheless, destroy agriculture and industry, to enrich with their spoils the accomplices of despotism; but that he should swear to the people these fundamental articles, these eternal bases of well regulated societies. Liberty of worship, this first right of all men, since authority can never force conscience. Equality of rights of all the citizens, the only rational and possible equality. Respect for political and civil liberty, without which nations are but herds of slaves, equally indifferent to the fortune of their masters, and to their own destiny. The inviolable security of property, which forbids above all the levy of arbitrary imposts, and permits not any subsidy, direct or indirect, under what name soever, but according to law.——Lastly, the general tendency of his government, to the sole and primitive end of every government, the interest, the happiness, and the glory of the people.—This is the form of the oath which your Imperial Majesty is about to take to the French people; these are the terms which you have chosen to be a law to yourself and your successors. According to circumstances, your Majesty annexes to them an engagement to maintain: the integrity of the territory of the French republic, which should continue indivisible; the acquisition of the national property, which have been the pay of our independence: the sublime institution of your legion of honour, worthy reward of services rendered to the country.—With these additions, this remarkable oath would appear to have been dictated by the whole nation. It is in consideration of this also, that the whole nation swears fidelity to you. These two oaths correspond; they guarantee each other; they are the reciprocal pledges of an indissoluble alliance; and amidst so many important views, which will for ever distinguish the *Senatus Consultum* of the 19th May (28th Floreal), that which cements the whole work; that which imprints upon it the seal of immortality, Sire, is the thought of the title of the oaths.——To close the chasms of the revolution, more than Curtius was necessary: according to the profound idea of a political author, it was necessary that a great man should chuse for the theatre of his government and the materials of his glory, the ruins of that state, which he might propose to new-model and re invigorate. It was necessary that this man should be worthy to give his name, and to communicate his impulse to a new dynasty. It was necessary that he should be elevated above his contemporaries, of their choice, and by their suffrages, without opposition either from his own countrymen, or from foreigners. In the existing state of societies, the want of being governed is felt, as formerly, but the means of governing are become more difficult, because their object is more extended and complicated.—The Conservative Senate and the French people assure you, Sire, through my voice, that they are proud of their Emperor. If they have offered you the crown, if they have made it hereditary in your descendants, and in those of your two brothers, it is because there exists not on earth a man more worthy to bear the sceptre of France, nor a family

more beloved by the French. Governed by Napoleon, or by his sons or his nephews, animated by his spirit, formed by his example, in a word, bound by his oath, we Sire, and our childrens' children, shall defend, with our lives, this tutelary government, object of our pride as of our love, because in it we shall defend our chief, our properties, our families, and our honour.—You have chosen, Sire, as the inscription on our coins, those words which you justify: "God protects France." Oh! yes; God does protect France, since he has created you for her. Father of thy country, in the name of that protecting God, bestow a blessing on thy children, and relying on their fidelity, be assured that nothing can either efface from their minds, or root out of their hearts, the engagements resulting from the mutual contract that has just been entered into between the French nation and the imperial family. —In the absence of the throne, all the great characters give themselves up to factions. A people is so much the more to be pitied, the greater the number of its distinguished children; all that might constitute pride of nations becomes then the scourge of one. From the moment that a throne is worthily filled, eminent virtues have a reward; viz. to approach nearer to it; and the distinction is so much more flattering, as more real dignities bear more imposing names. The title of Emperor has ever conveyed the law not of that royalty before which subjects humble and prostrate themselves, but the great and liberal idea of a first magistrate governing in the name of the law which citizens feel honour in obeying. The title of Senate indicates also an assembly of chosen magistrates, proved by long labours and venerable for age. The greater the Emperor is, the more august ought the Senate to be."

His Majesty replied in the following terms:

"I ascend the throne, to which the unanimous wishes of the senate, the people, and the army have called me, with a heart penetrated with the great destinies of that people, whom, from the midst of camps, I first saluted with the name of Great. From my youth my thoughts have been solely fixed upon them; and I must add here, that my pleasures and my pains are derived entirely from the happiness or misery of my people. ——My descendents shall long preserve this throne. In the camps they will be the first soldiers of the army, sacrificing their lives for the defence of their country. As magistrates, they will never forget, that contempt of the laws and the confusion of social order, are only the result of the imbecility and uncertainty of princes. You, senators, whose counsels and support have never failed me in the most difficult circumstances; your spirit will be handed down to your successors. Be ever the props and first counsellors of that throne so necessary to the welfare of this vast Empire."

The tribunate presented itself in a body at the Thuilleries, on the same day, at two o'clock. M. Fabre (de l'Ande), the president, addressed the Emperor, in the name of the body.—"The address contains nothing worth noticing, except the abject servility with which the tribunate avow their joy that they had been the first to conceive the wish to give their country an authorised master, (the question respecting the elevation of Buonaparté to the Empire was first started in the tribunate). The address concludes with wishes "that the new dynasty may reign as long as the three preceding ones, and that the days of his Majesty may be prolonged beyond the ordinary term of human life!"

FOREIGN OFFICIAL PAPER.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.—*Message delivered by the President of the United States of America to both Houses of Congress, Nov. 8, 1804.*

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.—"To a people, fellow citizens, who sincerely desire the happiness and prosperity of other nations, to those who justly calculate that their own well being is advanced by that of other nations with which they have intercourse, it will be a satisfaction to observe, that the war, which was lighted up in Europe a little before our last meeting, has not yet extended its flames to other nations, not been marked by the calamities which sometimes stain the footsteps of war. The irregularities, too, on the ocean, which generally harass the commerce of neutral nations, have, in distant parts, disturbed our's less than on former occasions. But in the American seas they have been greater from peculiar causes; and even within our harbours and jurisdiction, infringements on the authority of the laws have been committed, which have called for serious attention. The friendly conduct of the governments from whose officers and subjects these acts have proceeded, in other respects, and in places more under their observation and control, gives us confidence that our representations on this subject will have been properly regarded.——While noticing the irregularities committed on the ocean by others, those on

our own part should not be omitted, nor left unprovided for. Complaints have been received that persons residing within the United States, have taken upon themselves to arm merchant vessels, and to force a commerce into certain ports and countries, in defiance of the laws of those countries. That individuals should undertake to wage private war, independently of the authority of their country, cannot be permitted in a well ordered society. Its tendency to produce aggression on the laws and rights of other nations, and to endanger the peace of our own, is so obvious, that I doubt not you will adopt measures for restraining it in future.——Soon after the passing of the act of last session, authorizing the establishment of a district and port of entry on the waters of the Mobile, we learnt that its object was misunderstood on the part of Spain. Candid explanations were immediately given, and assurances that, reserving our claims in that quarter as a subject of discussion and arrangement with Spain, no act was meditated in the mean-time inconsistent with the peace and friendship existing between the two nations; and that, conformably to those intentions would be the execution of the law. That government had, however, thought proper to suspend the ratification of the convention of 1802; but the explanations which would reach them soon after, and still more the confirmation of them by the tenor of the instrument, establishing the port and district, may reasonably be expected to replace them in the disposition and views of the whole subject which originally dictated the convention.——I have the satisfaction to inform you, that the objections which had been urged by that government against the validity of our title to the country of Louisiana, have been withdrawn: — its exact limits, however, remaining still to be settled between us. And to this is to be added, that having prepared and delivered the stock created in execution of the Convention of Paris of April the 30th, 1803, in consideration of the cession of that country, we have received from the government of France an acknowledgment in due form of the fulfilment of that stipulation.——With the nations of Europe in general our friendship and intercourse are undisturbed; and from the governments of the belligerent powers especially, we continue to receive those friendly manifestations which are justly due to an honest neutrality, and to such good offices consistent with that as we have opportunities of rendering. —— The activity and success of the small force employed in the Mediterranean in the early part of the present year, the reinforcements sent into that sea, and the energy of the officers having command in the several vessels, will, I trust, by the sufferings of war, reduce the barbarians of Tripoli to the desire of peace, on proper terms. Great injury, however, ensues to ourselves, as well as to others interested, from the distance to which the prizes must be brought for adjudication, and from the impracticability of bringing hither such as are not seaworthy.——The Bey of Tunis having made requisitions unauthorized by our treaty, their rejection has produced from him some expressions of discontent. But to those who expect us to calculate whether a compliance with unjust demands will not cost us less than a war, we must leave as a question of calculation for them also, whether to retire from unjust demands will not cost them less than a war. We can do to each other very sensible injuries by war. But the mutual advantages of peace make that the best interest of both.——Peace and intercourse with the other powers on the same coast continue on the footing on which they are established by treaty.——In pursuance of the act, providing for the temporary government of Louisiana, the necessary officers for the territory of Orleans, were appointed in due time to commence the exercise of their functions on the first day of Oct. The distance, however, of some of them, and indispensable previous arrangements may have retarded its commencement in some of its parts. The form of government thus provided, having been considered but as temporary, and open to such future improvements, as further information of the circumstances of our brethren there might suggest, it will of course be subject to fair consideration. —— In the district of Louisiana it has been thought best to adopt the division into subordinate districts which had been established under its former government. These being five in number, a commanding officer has been appointed to each, according to the provisions of the law; and so soon as they can be at their stations, that district will also be in its due state of organization. In the mean-time, their places are supplied by officers before commanding there, and the functions of the governor and judges of Indiana having commenced, the government we presume is proceeding in its new form. The lead mines in that district offer so rich a supply of that metal as to merit attention. The report now communicated will inform you of their state, and of the necessity of immediate

inquiry into their occupation and titles.—— With the Indian tribes established within our newly acquired limits, I have deemed it necessary to open conferences for the purpose of establishing a good understanding and neighbourly relations between us. So far as we have yet learned, we have reason to believe that their dispositions are generally favourable and friendly. And with these dispositions on their part, we have in our hands means which cannot fail for preserving their peace and friendship. Instead of an augmentation of military force, proportioned to an augmentation of frontier, I propose a moderate enlargement of the capital employed in that commerce, as a more effectual, economical, and humane instrument for preserving peace and good neighbourhood with them.——On this side the Mississippi, an important relinquishment of native title has been received from the Delawares, that tribe desiring to extinguish the spirit of hunting, and to convert superfluous lands into the means of improving what they retain, has ceded to us all the country between the Wabash and the Ohio, South of, and including the road from the Rapids towards Vincennes, for which they are to receive annuities in animals and implements of agriculture. The Pinkeshaws having some claim to the country ceded by the Delawares, it has been thought better to quiet that claim by fair purchase also. So soon as the treaties on this subject shall have received their constitutional sanctions, they shall be laid before both houses.—— The Act of Congress of Feb. 28, 1803, for building and employing a number of gunboats is now in a course of execution to the extent there provided, for the obstacle to naval enterprise,

[*To be continued.*]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

FAMILY RECONCILIATION.—There is, and long has been, in this country, a sort of *political family*, consisting of the Pitts and the Addingtons, augmented at different periods, by the admission of the Jenkinsons, the Dundases, and, more recently, by the Roses, the Longs, and others of the same description. There are three main principles, upon which this family appear invariably to have acted: 1. That the members of The Family are the only men worthy of being entrusted with the management of public affairs in this kingdom: 2. That they have an undoubted right to the exclusive possession or disposal of all the honours, power, and emoluments, that can be possessed or disposed of in this kingdom: 3. That the maintenance of this right is their first duty, and that, in competition therewith, no other object ought to be suffered to exist for a single moment. Those, therefore, who consider the natural consequences of these principles, will not be at all surprised at the reconciliation which has taken place between Mr. Addington and Mr. Pitt; and, my Lord Grenville must excuse me, if I express my surprise, when, in 1803, I hear a person of his sagacity and experience, declaring, that "nothing is "less probable than to see Pitt and me at "any near period (I believe I may say "*at no period of our lives*) reconciled, and "disposed to establish with Addington re-"lations of confidence and friendship."* His Lordship is thought to be endowed with great knowledge and penetration; but, he was not able to discover the real sentiments and intentions of Mr. Pitt, though he appears to have been, as he thought, made fully acquainted with them. He does not seem to have viewed the connexion between the Pitts and the Addingtons in the proper light: the nature of their bond of union appears to have entirely escaped him, or, he would have perceived, that, like the members of other families, however bitterly, and on whatever account, they might quarrel, they would finally be reconciled, as far at least as should be necessary to promote the interests of The Family, more especially if its very existence should be at stake. By a reference to the motto of the present sheet, it will be perceived that the reconciliation has not come upon me unawares. To say the truth, I expected it to take place sooner, and, when I saw the meeting of Parliament approaching without any reconciliation being talked of, I began to tremble for the fate of my theory.—The reconciliation has been termed "the mar-"riage of *weakness* and *meanness*;" but very improperly in my opinion; for, though it is pretty evident that Mr. Pitt found himself weak, it should not be forgotten, that there are some men, none of whose actions ought ever to be distinguished by the epithet *mean*, and, I believe, it will hardly be denied that Mr. Addington is a man of that description. The "marriage," whatever may be said or thought of it, is perfectly natural. The principal parties concerned were, as one of their own newspapers (the tender and delicate Morning Post) observes "made to respect, to love, and to cherish "each other." Their disputes have been

* Lord Grenville's Letter to Marquis Wellesley, present Volume, p. 533.

much more of a *private* than of a *public* nature. They could not exactly agree as to the share which each should enjoy of the power and emoluments of the state, and thereupon some little bickering took place; but, as it never was, perhaps, very liberal or very decent to pry into the affairs of The Family, it would be still less so now to revive the circumstances attendant on their quarrel. What if one side dealt forth charges of "arrogance and duplicity," which the other repaid by charges of "incapacity and imbecility," who but the parties themselves have any thing to do with the matter? There are very few families, in which (especially where there are great possessions to be shared, and complicated claims and pretensions to be adjusted) disputes, even serious disputes, do not frequently occur; yet, we do not find that any body has ever been much applauded for endeavouring to revive such disputes, especially at a moment when the parties are about to be reconciled; and, I should be glad to know, why this particular Family should be excluded from the beneficent effects of those liberal and humane principles which operate in favour of all other families in the world?——As to the *terms* of the reconciliation we may, however, I think, be allowed to indulge in an observation or two. At present we are, upon this point, left to conjecture. It has been said, indeed, by some, that Mr. Addington is to be Secretary of State; by others he is destined "to ornament the peerage of the realm." Mr. Yorke too, the Right Honourable Mr. Bragge, the Right Honourable Mr. Hiley Addington, and some other "men of "great abilities" are said, by the ministerial papers, to be about to be introduced into the ministry, if not into the cabinet, and, the Times Newspaper, well known to be the mouth piece of the junior main branch of the family, has stated, (25th inst.) that, from these changes, the public will derive security for "a *constitutional* use of authority at home, and "for *wisdom* in the conducting of our foreign affairs." The same paper, of the 28th instant, congratulates the public upon the natural consequences of the expected introduction of Mr. Addington and his friends into the cabinet; and that, not on account of its bringing more votes to the aid of the minister, but on account of the good which the country may expect to derive from the statesman-like talents, the cabinet wisdom and energy, of Mr. Addington and his friends. "Though," says this print, "we pretend not to be in the secret," (they evidently are) "we cannot but rejoice, as "Englishmen, in the prospect of such a reconciliation as has been announced. Should "Mr. Addington and his friends be included in any new ministerial arrangement, we "will venture to predict, that the public "will *soon perceive* that something more than "mere *parliamentary strength* will be *added* "to the government. They will soon find "*beneficial effects* from the virtues and *talents of that minister*, who *relieved the* "*country from all its pecuniary embarrassments*; who *found the Treasury empty, and* "*left it full*; who, by his excellent arrangements, in one year, funded the incredible "sum of ninety-seven millions, *while the* "*people scarcely felt an additional burthen*; "who provided *permanent resources for the* "*war*, of which his successors and his "country now find the benefit.—We do "not wish to renew a debate which was, "and is, likely to be injurious to the country; but we must say, that no epithets "were ever more *falsely*, or more *iniquitously* "*employed*, by any faction, than those of "*weak* and *inefficient*, when applied to a (Mr. "Addington's) ministry."—The reader will recollect *who* employed those epithets so liberally; and, if he be one of those shallow persons who rejoiced at Mr. Pitt's *triumph* over Mr. Addington, he must, one would think, be stung even to madness. How Mr. Canning, and such persons, must feel, it is easier to conceive than to describe. Language like that above quoted from The Times is, however, exactly such as was to be expected from the Addingtons, in this day of their victory; and, hard as it may be for the haughty and arrogant Pittites to swallow it, swallow it they must, and quietly too There have, however, in the SUN (a paper devoted to the senior main branch of The Family) been some attempts made to disguise the humiliation of the Pittites, who, in this their print, have endeavoured to give to the reconciliation such a turn as to cause it to be regarded as proceeding from forgiveness and generosity, on the part of Mr. Pitt, who is represented as having *now* consented to reward Mr. Addington for his long and useful labours as *Speaker*. "The political obstacles," says the SUN, "which were placed in the way of his laboriously-acquired honours, have been "removed by the condescension of his "Sovereign and the MAGNANIMITY *of Mr.* "*Pitt*." Magnanimity means greatness of mind generally, but, in the more confined and usual application of the word, it means greatness of mind which is shown in forbearance or indulgence towards *a vanquished*

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.

foe. The Addingtons appear to understand it in this way, and they take fire at it accordingly. "In justice to one of the most "meritorious, but most ill-treated charac- "ters which this country ever produced, "but who is too high-minded himself to "notice the little calumnies with which he "is daily attacked by *a brood of reptiles*, we "beg leave to state a notorious fact, well "known to every person who at the time "attended to political transactions, and we "pledge our character with the public for "the truth of what we assert, that there "*never was any obstacle* whatever to Mr. "Addington's receiving those honours and "rewards which are alluded to by the SUN, "on the moment of his quitting office, but "his own high sense of dignity, and *his re-* "*fined sentiments of honour and of patriot-* "*ism.*"—— Perhaps the moralists and politicians of the age, will, ere long, be favoured with an explanation of those "*refined* "sentiments of honour and of patriotism," under the influence of which Mr. Addington acted, and is now acting; but, whether he would not, or could not, get a peerage without the consent of Mr. Pitt; whether he now intends to take the coronet himself, or (according to the "refined" and manly sentiments, and in laudable imitation, of the great founder of The Family) to place it, a little at first, upon the head of his lady; whether he intends to defer the assumption of "his laboriously-acquired honours," and, in the mean-time, to take upon him, according to the notion thrown out through The Times, the restoring of things to the flourishing state in which he left them; whatever may be *his* motives and intentions, we cannot, I think, be much at a loss to guess at the motives of Mr. Pitt. The state of parties, in parliament, has, for some time past, been somewhat new. Ever since the resignation of Mr. Pitt and his colleagues, in 1801, the old order of things, that is, *an Opposition and a Ministerial Party*, has been suspended. There were, till the last meeting of parliament *four* parties: the party of the Minister, that of the Old Opposition, that of Mr. Pitt, and that of the New Opposition. At the last meeting of parliament, the Old and New Oppositions became one At the change, the Old and New Oppositions remained united, but there sprung up the party of the Addingtons: a very small one to be sure; but one that, "under existing circumstances," was not to be despised by Mr. Pitt. We have seen the parliament prorogued to a distance of time that was hardly to be expected, considering the urgent state of things; we have heard the "fond hopes" that the ministerial writers expressed relative to the "*parliamentary* "aid," which the minister was to receive from the friends of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; we know that these hopes have been blasted; we have heard of the several persons, to whom a certain high office has been offered without success In short, every expedient seems to have failed, and the minister appears to have been somewhat in the situation of Jove, in the nocturnal ramble, which, in poetic history, he is said to have taken:

"For shelter at a thousand doors he knock'd;
"Not one of all the thousand but was lock'd."

Till, at last, he found a welcome at the hut of BAUCIS, to commemorate his gratitude for which, the good *old woman* was liberally *rewarded*, and, finally, her fame was preserved by a most distinguished and flattering *metamorphosis*.——To the Opposition nothing more agreeable than this reconciliation could possibly have happened. It has removed out of their way the last obstacle to the free discussion of every public measure that has been adopted from the time that Mr. Pitt first became minister to the present hour. There is no longer any temptation, from an over-strained delicacy, to compromise principles, even in the very smallest degree. Not only are there now two, and *only two*, parties; but, these parties, contain, each of them, *all* the men of one of the two sorts. There is no longer any confusion of principles, any heterogeneous mixture of characters. There are two distinct systems of policy, two distinct descriptions of politicians, and two distinct parties, to which politicians will now

DIRECTIONS TO THE BOOK-BINDER.

It is to be observed, that this sheet, which is the last of Volume VI. should *not be cut open* by the reader, but should be left to the Bookbinder, who will perceive, that the *first* half sheet, of which this page makes a part, comes at the *end*, and that the other half sheet, containing the Title Page, Advertisement, and Table of Contents, is to be cut off, and placed at the *beginning* of the Volume.

Supplement to No. 26, Vol. VI.—Price 10d.

now be known to belong. [I regret that I am compelled, for want of room, to stop here. The subject shall be continued in the next sheet.]

TEST-LAWS.—Upon this subject my correspondent P. wishes me to be cautious in expressing my sentiments; because, says he, "your sentiments have great weight, and I "am sorry to see them incline towards the "admission of *sectaries* especially, who are "already labouring incessantly to the de-"struction of the established Church"—It is not a little surprizing, that this gentleman, a professed partisan of Mr. Pitt, should express so much alarm at the probable effect of my poor powerless sentiments, in favour, as he appears to think, of the sectaries, when he cannot but know, that Mr. Pitt's power was founded upon sectarian principles, and has been, in a great degree, upheld by sectarian support. Mr. Pitt has always been the favourer of dissenters, in preference to the Church. No small part of his colleagues and of his close friends and adherents have been, and are, of that description; and, the project for abolishing the tithes sufficiently prove his desire to promote the interests and to provide for the permanence of the Church. I once before observed, that to be a partisan of Mr. Pitt and a real friend of the Church of England was, in my opinion, impossible; and, I must confess, that, if any thing could make me abandon the Church, in which I was baptized, and in the faith of which I have been bred up, it would be the seeing of so many clergymen rank themselves amongst the partisans of a minister, who, under the name of redemption of the land tax, caused much of the best sort of Church property to be alienated, and who thereby made a precedent for a series of alienations, which must end in the total destruction of the establishment. Such clergymen may be good friends to themselves; they may desire to preserve their own incomes and authority; but, they are no friends of the Church.——As to the question of the Test-Laws, I have taken great pains to obtain information upon the subject, and I am convinced, that their entire repeal would be preferable to their present operation, which, in fact, is to the disability and disadvantage of Roman Catholics *only*. This gentleman seems to think, that my sentiments lean towards the granting of indulgence to the "sectaries"; and he is ready to allow, that the Roman Catholics are harmless; whom, it is not unreasonable to infer, that he would have little objection to repealing the Test-Laws as far as relates to the Roman Catholics, if he could preserve them in full force with respect to the "sectaries." Here I perfectly agree with him in sentiment and in wishes; but, as the laws now stand and operate, they are no bar at all against the "sectaries", and are an effectual bar against the Roman Catholics, whose disqualifications are more numerous and whose exclusion is much more comprehensive, than those of the sectaries, and who experience, in the workings of their conscience, an obstacle which it is to be feared, is of little force against the interest or ambition of sectaries in general, and which cannot be overcome by the absolving virtue of an annual bill of indemnity. As the Test-Laws now stand, a sectary can be a member of either house of Parliament and fill any office of the state; a Roman Catholic cannot, without abjuring his religion. As to offices in the magistracy and in corporations, the sectaries and Roman Catholics are, in England, upon the same footing in *law*, but not in *fact*; for, who is there that will be bold enough to say, that he can produce an instance of a sectary having hesitated, for one moment, at *occasional conformity*; or, of a Roman Catholic having ever, in any one instance, yielded to it? Indeed, are not one-half of the corporations in the kingdom divided between the sectaries and the members of the Church? In many corporations have not the sectaries an ascendency? Of several, and those important ones too, have they not the exclusive possession? I have conversed with a sectarian magistrate, who laughed at my simplicity in wondering how he could take the Sacrament, according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, and still openly avow himself a *dissenter*: he really laughed in my face. The Test-Laws, therefore, are, as I have said above, Tests for the Roman Catholics only; they, are, in the letter, against both Roman Catholics and sectaries; but, in the spirit, or, at least, in their effect against the former exclusively; and, as my correspondent himself confesses, that the Roman Catholics are harmless, he will, I think, find it very difficult to shew, that the sentiments to which I have given circulation, tend to the injury of the Church of England, or to that throne, of which I always have considered, and do still consider, the established Church as one of the principal pillars.—— There is much more to say upon this subject; but another and better opportunity will offer. In the mean time, I cannot but hope, that sufficient has now been said to convince my correspondent, that it has not been without due consideration, that I have given publicity to sentiments such as those which he has thought worthy of his attention.

Table of the Number of *Christenings* and *Burials* within the Bills of Mortality, from June to November 1804, inclusive.

Epochs.	Christened.		Buried.											Total Buried.	
	Male.	Female	Under 2 Years.	2 to 5.	5 to 10.	10 to 20.	20 to 30.	30 to 40.	40 to 50.	50 to 60.	60 to 70.	70 to 80.	80 to 90.	90 to 100, &c.	Males	Female
June.....	873	781	358	137	44	43	96	137	128	120	78	53	26	5	642	583
July.....	925	802	342	124	43	37	91	127	131	102	72	61	27	4	581	571
August.....	1016	900	459	135	44	38	106	141	153	110	108	69	30	2	791	713
September	783	741	392	153	49	33	82	116	122	102	81	58	31	7	626	699
October	889	789	406	141	58	31	102	150	141	111	87	61	33	6	886	633
November.....	1000	936	450	168	67	37	113	181	195	166	122	78	37	6	812	798
	5491	4949	2407	858	305	219	590	852	870	701	548	380	184	30	4248	3997

Total Christenings . 10440 — Total Burials . . 8245

Table of the Prices of the *Quartern Loaf*, in London, from June to November, 1804, inclusive.

June		July		Aug.		Sep.		Oct.		Nov.	
Day.	Price.	Day.	Price.	Day	Price.	Day.	Price.	Day.	Price.	Day.	Price.
	s. d.		*s. d.*		*s. d.*		*s. d.*		*s. d.*		*s. d.*
6	8½	4	8½	1	8¼	5	11¼	3	1. 0	7	1. 1¼
13	8½	11	8¼	8	10	12	11	10	1. 0¼	14	1. 1½
20	8½	18	0¼	15	10¾	19	11½	17	1. 0½	21	1. 2½
27	8½	25	9¼	22	1. 0	26	11½	24	1. 0¾	28	1. 4

Table of the Prices of *Meat, Sugar, Salt*, and *Coals*, in London, from June to November, 1804, inclusive.

	June	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	
	s. d.	*s. d.*	*s. d.*	*s. d.*	*s. d.*	*s. d.*	per Stone of 8lb. to sink the Offal.
Beef ..	5 8	5 8	5 0	5 4	5 0	5 4	
Mutton	4 8	5 4	5 0	5 4	5 0	5 0	
Pork ..	4 0	4 8	5 0	5 4	4 8	5 0	
Sugar	56 7	58 7¼	48 9¾	49 11½	53 0½	58 1¼	Cwt.
Salt ..	14 0	14 0	14 0	14 0	14 0	14 0	Bushel.
Coals..	48 0	51 6	51 6	53 0	59 0	57 0	Chald.

Table of the Prices of the English *Three per Cent. Consols*, from June to Nov., 1804, inclusive.

Day.	June	July	Aug.	Sep	Oct.	Nov.
1	Shut.	—	56⅞	—	56⅞	57½
2	—	57¼	57¼	—	56¾	57⅞
3	—	57¼	56⅞	—	57⅛	57⅞
4	—	57⅛	56¾	57⅜	57⅛	—
5	—	57½	—	57⅛	57⅜	—
6	—	57¼	56⅞	57½	57⅜	58⅜
7	—	57¼	57	57½	—	58½
8	—	—	56⅞	57½	57	58¼
9	—	57⅜	57	—	56⅞	—
10	—	57⅜	56½	57⅛	57⅛	58½
11	—	57¼	56⅜	57¼	57⅜	—
12	—	57⅛	—	57¼	57¼	58⅜
13	—	57½	—	57⅜	57½	58⅜
14	—	56½	56½	57¼	—	58¼
15	—	—	56½	57⅜	57⅜	58¼
16	—	57¼	56½	—	57½	58½
17	—	57¼	57	57⅛	57⅛	58⅜
18	—	57⅜	57	57⅜	57⅜	—
19	—	57⅛	—	57⅛	57¼	58¼
20	—	57⅜	56⅝	57½	—	58½
21	—	57⅜	57	—	57¼	58⅜
22	—	—	56⅞	—	57⅛	58½
23	—	58⅛	57	—	57⅛	58¼
24	—	58⅛	—	57⅜	57¼	58¼
25	—	—	57⅛	57½	—	—
26	—	58⅛	—	57¼	—	58⅛
27	—	58½	57⅛	57½	57⅛	58¼
28	57¼	58¼	57	57½	—	
29	—	—	56⅝	—	57⅛	
30	57⅛	58½	57	—	57⅜	
31	—	58⅛	57½	—	57½	

Table of the Prices of the French *Five per Cent. Consolidés*, from June to November, 1804, inclusive.

Day.	June	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.
1	57.45	56.80	57.10	—	56.20	56.60
2	57.50	56.85	57.10	56.50	56.10	—
3	57.45	56.80	57.40	56.40	—	58.30
4	57.60	56.80	—	—	56.90	—
5	57.75	56.80	—	56.50	56.90	58.70
6	—	56.75	57. 0	56.50	56.90	58.80
7	—	57.70	—	56.50	—	59.
8	—	56.75	—	56.60	—	59.
9	57.60	56.75	—	56.60	56.70	58.70
10	—	—	57.10	56.70	56.80	58.70
11	—	—	57.10	56.75	56.80	58.75
12	57.60	56.80	57. 0	—	57.	58.75
13	57.55	56.80	57. 0	57. 0	57.	—
14	57.55	56.85	—	57.15	57.15	58.65
15	57.55	56.85	—	57. 0	57.50	58.60
16	57.55	56.85	—	57. 0	57.50	58.50
17	—	—	57.10	57. 0	57.40	58.60
18	57.50	56.90	57.10	57. 0	57.50	58.60
19	57.45	56.75	57. 0	56.90	57.55	—
20	—	56.65	57.10	56.90	57.50	58.75
21	—	56.75	57. 0	56.90	—	58.80
22	57.40	56.80	—	56.90	57.60	58.80
23	57.40	56.90	—	56.85	—	58.85
24	57.35	57. 0	—	56.60	58.40	58.80
25	57.30	57. 0	57.15	56.60	58.40	58.75
26	—	—	—	56.65	58.50	58.75
27	—	56.50	57.15	—	58.50	—
28	56.90	—	57. 0	—	58 75	—
29	56.85	56.85	57. 0	—	59.	58.80
30	56.85	56.90	56.60	56.40	59.	58.85
31	—	56.90	—	—	59.	—

Table of the Number of *Bankrupts* in England, from June to November, 1804, inclusive.

June	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.
55	54	59	55	50	66

INDEX.

A.

A. B. on Mr. Pitt's finance resolutions, 195.
A. B. on the slave trade, 231.
A. B. on Mr. Pitt's finance resolutions, 470.
A. B. on military officers' pay, 957.
Agricola's letter proposing a remedy against the evils of depreciated notes, 586.
Alfred on the navigation with the West Indies, 196.
Allocution delivered by the Pope previously to his departure from Rome, in order to assist in the Coronation of the Emperor Napoleon, 892, 958.
American Claims on France; Account of, 646.
Amicus, on the slave trade, 178.
Annibal on the bank dollar bill, 26.
——— on Mr. Pitt's finance resolutions, 33.
———, on the scarcity of coin, 638.
A. R. on the Conduct of the Bank Directors, 193. Observations on, 214.
Army, review of the measures relating to the, 100.
Army, observations on the want of an, 787.
A. T. on a War of Words, 1008.
Austria, Emperor of; observations on his assumption of that title, 405.

B.

B. on Scotch Small-Bounty Men, 128.
Bank Directors; A. R. on the conduct of, 193. Observations on, 214.
Bank Dollar Bill; Annibal's letter on, 26.
Bank Dollars and Tokens; observations on, 41.
Bank Notes; J. T. on the effect of, on the price of provisions, 417.
Bank Notes; Crito, on the refusal of, 955.
Bank of England Law; Scrutator on, 175.
Bath Volunteers; on the conduct of, 301, 311.
Birmingham Dollars; C. B. on, 225. Observations on, 246.
B. L., on the project of revolutionizing South America, 833.
Blockading System; Britanicus on, 680.
Bonney, J. A.; his letter relative to a falsehood contained in Mr. H. Thornton's Speech, 424.
Boulogne; curious account of the festival at, in honour of Buonaparté's Birth-day, 491.
Bread and Labour; P. on the price of, 814.
——; on the high price of, 844.
——, price of; observations on, 255. 304.
——; table of the prices of, from June to Dec., 1804. 1069.
Britannicus, on the Blockading System, 680.
———, on the Repeal of the Coronation and Test Acts, Letter First, 810. Second Letter, 911.
British Observer, The; his letter on the Catholic Claims, 90.
British Ship-Owners; address to the, 353. Observations on, 368.
Buonaparté; Organic Senatus Consultum conferring on him the Title of Emperor of the French, 202, 477. See Napoleon.
——— ———; curious account of the Festival at Boulogne, in honour of the Birth-day of, 491.
Buonaparté, Jerome; Intercepted letters relative to, 685, 771.

C.

C. on the Internal State of Jamaica, 133.
Camillus on the Causes of the French Revolution, 385.
Canning, Mr. and Lord Hawkesbury; on the conduct of those gentlemen, with respect to the New Ministry, 783, 824, 1012.
Cars, Military; inquiry into the utility of, 312, 351, 362.
Catamaran Expedition; Lord Keith's Official Account of, 557.
———————; strictures on, 570, 669.
———, the; an excellent New Ballad, 640.
Catamaran Expedition; French account of, 647.
Catholics of Ireland; An Irish Freeholder's letter on, 629. Observations on, 664, 735. His second letter, 801.
Catholic Claims; The British Observer's letter on the, 900.
C. B., on the Birmingham Dollars, 225. Observations on, 246.
Censor, on the Royal Prerogative, 142.
Chester Volunteers; on the conduct of the, 704.
Cobbett, Mr.; his observations on the distresses and disputes which have lately arisen in the Island of Jamaica, 1.
———————; his letter to Mr. Pitt on his Finance Resolutions, 97. Second Letter, 161.
———————; his first Letter to Mr. Pitt, on the Causes of the Decline of Great Britain, 449. Second Letter, 513. Third Letter, 609. Fourth Letter, 737. Fifth Letter, 865. Sixth Letter, 929.
Coin, scarcity of; Annibal on, 638.
Colonies, conquered; Publius on the laws in, 587.
———————; X. X. on the, 815.
Continent; on the State of, 187.
Continental Alliances, 319.
Convention concluded between the Emperor Napoleon and the reigning Count of Steinfurth, 159.
Coronation of the Emperor Napoleon; decree for the, 126.
Coronation and Test Acts; Britannicus on the Repeal of, 810. Second Letter, 911.
Coronation of the Emperor Napoleon; narrative of, 1009.
Corn; high price of, essay on, 844.
Corn Bill; Mr. Cobbett's Letter to Mr. Pitt on the, 865.
Corn Laws; observations on, 82.
Craufurd, Sir James; observations on his parole, 727.
———————; Regulus, on the subject of his parole, 914.
Crito, on the Refusal of Bank Notes, 955.
Currency, paper; observations on Foster on, 83.
———, Irish; state of, 121.
———————; J. T. on the state of, 137.
———————; J. T.'s second Letter on the state of, 321.

D.

D. B. on the effects of Paper Money in Times of Scarcity, 545. Observations on, 559. His second Letter, 919.
Decree for taking the Oath, and the Coronation of the Emperor Napoleon, 126.
Depreciation of Money; T. T. on the, 420.
Doddridge's Essay on Parliaments; T. M.'s letter on, 24.
Dollars, Birmingham; C. B. on, 225. Observations on, 226.
Domestic Official Papers, 70, 185, 211, 329, 494, 542, 557, 659.
Domingo, St.; state of, 124, 404.
———; narrative of the massacre in, 153.
D. W. on the Produce of Taxes, 174.
—— on Mr. Pitt's Finance Resolutions, 229.

E.

Enghien, Duke d'; letter written by him, a short time before his death, to the British Minister at Vienna, 476.

F.

Finance, French; state of, 410.
Finance Resolutions; Annibal on Mr. Pitt's, 33.
———; Mr. Cobbett's letter to Mr. Pitt on his, 97, 161.
———; A. B. on Mr. Pitt's, 195.
———; D. W. on Mr. Pitt's, 229.
———; observations on, 408.
———; A. B. on Mr. Pitt's, 470.
Financial Distresses the principal cause of the French Revolution, 385.
Foreign Official Papers, 30, 126, 484, 538, 685, 771, 892, 958.
Foster on Paper Currency; observations on, 83.
French Finance; state of, 410.
French Revolution; Financial Distresses the principal cause of, 385.

G.

Great Britain; Mr. Cobbett's first letter to Mr. Pitt, on the causes of the decline of, 449. Second letter, 513. Third letter, 609. Fourth letter, 737. Fifth letter, 865. Sixth letter, 929.
Grenville, Lord; intercepted letter from him to the Marquis of Wellesley, 530.

H.

Henderson, Col.; his correspondence with the Treasury, relative to the duties on Jamaica Produce, 65.
Henry VIth.; T. M.'s second letter on the Incapacity of, 460. Third letter, 577. Fourth letter, 804. Fifth letter, 893. Sixth letter, 1001.
Hibernicus, on the Irish Additional Force Bill, 467.
High Prices; essay on, 844.

I.

Invasion; observations on the threatened, 189, 251, 360, 431.
Ireland, Catholics of; An Irish Freeholder's letter on, 629. Observations on, 664, 735. His second letter, 801.
Ireland, state of; F.'s first letter on, 673. Second letter, 711. Third letter, 745. Fourth letter, 906. Fifth letter, 931.
Irish Additional Force Bill; Hibernicus on the, 467.
Irish Currency; state of, 121, 137.
Irish Currency; J. T. on the state of, 137.
———; J. T.'s second letter on the state of, 321.
Irish Freeholder's letter on the Catholics of Ireland, 629. Observations on, 664, 735. His second letter, 801.
Irish Paper Money; I. T. on the state of, 623, 705. Observations on, 665, 716.
Irish Small Notes; observations on, 46.
Irish Volunteers; Flaminius on the, 816.
J. T. on the state of Irish Currency, 137.
J. T.'s second letter on the state of Irish Currency, 321.
I. T. on the effect of Bank Notes on the price of Provisions, 417.
J. T. on Irish Paper Money, 628, 705. Observations on, 665, 716.

J.

Jacobinism; revival of, 412, 446, 510,
Jamaica; Mr. Cobbett's observations on the distresses and disputes which have lately arisen in the Island of, 1.
Jamaica Produce; Col. Henderson's correspondence with the Treasury, relative to the duties on, 65.
Jamaica; extracts from the Minutes of the Assembly of, relative to the French Prisoners brought thither from St. Domingo, 79.
Jamaica Complaints; observations on, 80.
———; internal state of, 124.
———; C. on the internal state of, 133.

K.

King and the Prince; on the reconciliation between the, 791.
King's Proclamation relative to the Meeting of Parliament, 543 King's Speech on proroguing Parliament, 185. Observations on, 190.

L.

Letter from T. M. on Doddridge's Essay on Parliaments, 24.
———— Annibal on the Bank Dollar Bill, 26.
———— on Mr. Pitts' Finance Resolutions, 33
———— Mr. Cobbett to Mr. Pitt, on his Finance Resolutions, 97. Second letter, 161.
———— B., on Scotch Small-Bounty Men, 128.
———— C., on the Internal State of Jamaica, 133.
———— J. T. on the State of Irish Currency, 137. Second letter, 321.
———— Sir R. Musgrave, on his History of the Irish Rebellion, 140.
———— Censor, on the Royal Prerogative, 142
———— O. B., on the Kingly Office, 152.
———— D. W., on the Produce of Taxes, 174.
———— Scrutator, on the Bank of England Law, 175.
———— Amicus, on the Slave Trade, 178.
———— A. R., on the Conduct of the Bank Directors, 193. Observation on, 214.
———— A. B., on Mr. Pitt's Finance Resolutions. 195.
———— Alfred, on the Navigation with the West Indies, 196.
———— C. B., on the Birmingham Dollars, 225. Observations on, 226.
———— D. W., on Mr. Pitt's Finance Resolutions, 229.
———— A. B., on the Slave Trade, 231.
———— Camillus, on the Causes of the French Revolution, 385.

Letter from J. T., on the effect of Bank Notes on the price of provisions, 417.
——— T. T. on the depreciation of Money, 420.
——— J. A. Bonney, relative to a falsehood contained in Mr. H. Thornton's Speech, 424.
——— Mr. Cobbett to Mr. Pitt, on the Causes of the Decline of Great Britain, 449. Second letter, 513 Third letter, 609. Fourth letter, 737. Fifth letter, 865. Sixth letter, 929.
——— T. M., on the Incapacity of Henry VIth., 460. Third letter, 577. Fourth letter, 804. Fifth letter, 893. Sixth letter, 1001.
——— T. N., on the Stamp Duties, 466.
——— Hibernicus on the Additional Force Bill, 467.
——— A. B., on Mr. Pitt's Finance Resolutions, 470.
Letter written by the Duke d'Enghien, a short time before his death, to the British Minister at Vienna, 476.
——— intercepted; from Lord Grenville to the Marquis Wellesley, 530.
——— intercepted; from Mr. H. Wellesley to the Marq. Wellesley, 534.
——— J. Turnbull, relative to the Dispute with Spain, 544.
——— D. B., on the effects of Paper Money in times of scarcity, 545. Observations on, 559. His second letter, 919.
——— Agricola, proposing a remedy against the evils of depreciated notes, 585.
——— Publius on the laws in the conquered Colonies, 587.
——— J. T. on Irish Paper Money, 623, 705. Observations on, 665, 716.
——— An Irish Freeholder, on the Catholics of Ireland, 629. Observations on, 664, 735. His second letter, 891.
——— Scipio, on Sir R. Wilson's Inquiry into the Military State of the British Empire, 632.
——— Annibal, on the Scarcity of Coin, 638.
——— Lord Nelson to the Lord Mayor of London, relative to a Vote of Thanks, 659. Observations on, 669.
——— Z., on the State of Ireland, 673. Second letter, 711. Third letter, 745. Fourth letter, 906. Fifth letter, 951.
——— Britannicus, on the Blockading System, 680.
——— Y., on Subscriptions in Military Bodies, 683.
——— Britannicus, on the Repeal of the Coronation and Test Acts, 810. Second letter, 911.
——— P., on the Price of Bread and Labour, 814.
——— X. X., on the Conquered Colonies, 815
——— Flaminius, on the Irish Volunteers, 816.
——— R. L., on the project of revolutionizing South America, 833.
——— A Norfolk Freeholder, relative to the Paston Papers, 899.
——— The British Observer, on the Catholic Claims, 900.
——— Regulus, on the subject of Sir James Craufurd, 914.
——— Crito, on the refusal of Bank Notes, 955.
——— A. B., on the Pay of Military Officers, 957.
——— P., in defence of Mr. Pitt, 995. Strictures on, 1012.
Letter from A. T., on a War of Words, 1008.
Letter from Col. Henderson to Mr. Pitt, relative to the Duties on Jamaica Produce, 65.
——— Addington, on the Duties of Jamaica Produce, 66.
——— Vansittart, on the Duties on Jamaica Produce, 71.
——— Edmund P. Lyon, Esq. Agent for the Island of Jamaica, to Col. Henderson, relative to the Duties on Jamaica Produce, 78.
Letters, intercepted; relative to Jerome Buonaparté, 685, 771.
Liberty of the Press; present state of, 1018.
Lloyds'; strictures on the Patriotic Fund at, 790.
Louis XVIII.; Protest of, 182.

M.

Man of no Party; description of, 831.
Middlesex Election; Narrative of the Principal Occurrences during the late, 257.
——— observations on, 304, 334.
Military Bodies; Y. on Subscriptions in, 683.
Military Car Project; inquiry into the utility of, 312, 351, 362, 440.
Military Officers' Pay; A. B. on, 957.
Military Project Law; observations on, 310, 437.
Ministerial Intrigues, 792, 825, 858.
Ministry; on the formation of the new, 53.
Money; T. T. on the depreciation of, 420.
Mounts' Bay Volunteers; Conduct of, 950.
Musgrave, Sir R.; letter from him, on his history of the Irish Rebellion, 140.

N.

Narrative of the Principal Occurrences during the late Election for Middlesex, 257.
——— Plot at Warsaw, 325, 471. Observations on, 430.
Napoleon; Decree for taking the Oath and the Coronation of the Emperor, 126.
———; Narrative of the Coronation of the Emperor, 1009, 1048.
——— on the consequences of his elevation to the Imperial Dignity, 911.
Nares, Mr. Archdeacon; dangerous tendency of his thanksgiving Sermon for Plenty, 857. His gross ignorance exposed, 857.
Navigation Laws; address to the British Ship-Owners, on the present state of, 353. Observations on, 368.
Nelson, Lord; his letter to the Lord Mayor of London, relative to a Vote of Thanks, 659. Observations on, 869.
Norfolk Freeholder's letter, on the subject of the Paston Papers, 889.

O.

O. B. on the Kingly Office, 152.

P.

P., on the Price of Bread and Labour, 814.
P.'s defence of Mr. Pitt, 995. Strictures on, 1012.
Papal Allocution, 892, 958.
Paper-Aristocracy of this Country; strictures on, 370.
Paper Currency; observations on Foster on, 83.
Paper Money; Agricola's letter, proposing a remedy against the evils of depreciated, 585.
——— D. B. on the effects of, in times of scarcity, 545. Observations on, 559. His second letter, 919.
——— Irish; J. T. on the state of, 618, 705. Observations on, 665, 716.

Paper Money System; Mr. Cobbett's letter to Mr. Pitt on, 737.
Parliament; King's Proclamation relative to the Meeting of, 543.
Parliaments; T. M.'s letter on Doddridge's Essay on, 24.
Patriotic Fund at Lloyd's; strictures on, 790.
Permanent Duty Men; observations on, 93.
Pitt, Mr.; Mr. Cobbett's letter to him, on his Finance Resolutions, 97, 161.
——; Mr. Cobbett's first letter to him, on the Causes of the Decline of Great Britain, 449. Second letter, 513. Third letter, 609. Fourth letter, 737. Fifth letter, 865. Sixth letter, 929.
——; P.'s letter in defence of, 995. Strictures on, 1012.
Plot at Warsaw; Narrative of, 325, 471. Observations on, 430.
Prerogative; Censor, on the Royal, 142.
Press; present state of the Liberty of the, 1018.
Price of Bread; observations on, 235, 304.
Price of Bread and Labour; P. on the, 814.
Prices; Essay on High, 844.
Provisions; J. T. on the effect of Bank Notes on the price of, 417.
Public Papers, 27, 36, 159, 182, 223, 424, 480, 538, 642, 750, 819, 887.
Publius on the laws in the Conquered Colonies, 587.

R.

Regulus, on the subject of Sir James Craufurd's Parole, 914.
Review of the measures relating to the Army, 100.
Rumbold, Sir George; narrative of the seizure of, 736, 782, 820.
Russia and France; Demi-Official Paper circulated on the Continent, relative to the dispute between, 488.
Russia; views of, 502.
—— Notes relative to the dispute between, 750.
—— view of the progress of the dispute between, 690.

S.

Scarcity; D. B. on the effects of Paper Money in times of, 545. Observations on, 559. His second letter, 911.
Scarcity of Coin; Annibal on, 638.
Scipio, on Sir R. Wilson's Inquiry into the State of the Military Force of the British Empire, 632.
Scotch Small-Bounty Men; B.'s letter on, 128.
Scrutator, on the Bank of England Law, 175.
Ship-Owners; Address to the British, 353. Observations on, 368.
Sketch of the present Prospect of the War, 929.
Slave Trade; Amicus on the, 178.
—— A. B., on the, 231.
South America; B. L. on the project of revolutionizing that country, 833.
Spain; observations on the dispute with, 512.
—— dispute with; letter from J. Turnbull relative to, 541.
—— observations on a War with, 595, 670.
Spanish Frigates; observations on the Capture of, 786.
——; capture of; article in the Moniteur relative to, 748.
Stamp Duty Bill; observations on, 52.
Stamp Duties; T. N. on the, 466.
Stocks; table of the prices of, from June to Nov. 1804, 1063.
Subscriptions in Military Bodies; Y.'s letter on, 683.
Summary of Politics, 41, 80, 120, 187, 214, 235, 304, 331, 360, 404, 428, 493, 559, 592, 604, 690, 716, 782, 820, 844, 1012, 1055.
Sweden, King of; article in the Moniteur, relative to the conduct of, 356.

T.

Table of the Number of Christenings and Burials within the Bills of Mortality from June to Nov, 1804, 1063.
Table of the Prices of the Quartern Loaf, in London, from June to Dec. 1804, 1063.
Table of the Prices of Meat, Sugar, Salt, and Coals, in London, from June to Nov. 1804, 1063
Table of the Prices of the English Three Per Cents Consols, from June to Nov. 1804, 1063.
Table of the French Five Per Cent. Consolidés from June to Nov. 1804, 1063.
Table of the Number of Bankruptcies from June to Nov. 1804, 1063.
Test and Coronation Acts; Britannicus on the Repeal of, 810. Second letter, 911.
T. M.'s Letter, on Doddridge's Essay on Parliaments, 24.
—— second letter on the Incapacity of Henry the VIth, 640. Third letter, 577. Fourth letter, 804 Fifth letter, 893. Sixth letter, 1061.
T. N. on the Stamp Duties, 466.
T. T. on the Depreciation of Money, 420.

U.

Ukase, issued by the Emperor of Russia, relative to the Admission of Foreigners into his Imperial Majesty's Dominions, 30.

V.

Volunteers; on the conduct of the Bath, 301, 311.
—— Chester; on the conduct of, 704.
—— Irish; Flaminius on the, 816.
—— Mount's Bay; conduct of, 950.
—— of Manchester and Knaresborough; strictures on the conduct of, 218.
—— System; facts relative to, 731.

W.

Wales, Princess Charlotte of; state of the dispute relative to the education of her Royal Highness, 1025, 1027.
War; observations on the present state of the, 87.
—— sketch of the present prospect of the, 929.
War of Words; A. T. on, 1008,
Warsaw; narrative of the Plot at, 325, 471. Observations on, 430.
Warwickshire Treason; observations on, 221.
Wellesley, Mr. H.; intercepted letter from him to the Marq. Wellesley, 534.
West Indies; Alfred on the Navigation with the, 196.
Wilson, Sir Robert; review of his Inquiry into the State of the Military Force of the British Empire, 494. Scipio's letter on, 632.

X.

X. X. on the Conquered Colonies, 815.

Y.

Y. on Subscriptions in Military Bodies, 683.

Z.

Z.'s first letter on the State of Ireland, 673. Second letter, 711. Third letter, 745. Fourth letter, 906. Fifth letter, 951.

INDEX OF PERSONS.

A.
Addington, 1, 56, 64, 65, 90, 105, 123, 383, 518, 612
Auckland, 162, 164, 611
Austria, Emp. of, 405, 424

B.
Best, 52
Bielfield, 234
Bildt, 428
Bonney, 424, 447
Boulton, 249
Bourne, 43
Boyd, 337
Bruix, 647, 655
Brune, 233, 482
Buonaparté, 87, 491, 685 771—See Napoleon
Burdett, 257, 332, 379, 412, 447, 510, 744

C.
Caillard, 483, 694
Calvert, 214
Canning, 33, 53, 58, 62, 365, 519, 783, 824, 864
Castlereagh, 34, 111, 311, 505
Cavendish, 219
Chalmers, 161, 165, 167, 229
Cobbett, 24, 100, 174, 460, 530, 623, 745, 880, 950
Cooke, 221
Cornwallis, 660
Corry, 136, 322
Coulon, 325, 430
Craufurd, 727, 914

D.
Decaen, 538
Dessalines, 32, 153
Dickenson, 52
D'Ivernois, 90, 108
Doddridge, 24, 152
D'Oubril, 29, 643, 696, 752, 758, 759, 890, 932
Drake, 27, 119, 765, 782, 935
Dundas, 5, 10

E.
Elliot, 106, 110
Enghein, 29, 88, 476, 691
Erskine, 825

F.
Foster, 84, 123, 214, 225, 244, 248, 417, 667, 716
Fox, 60, 320, 514, 525
Frere, 36

G.
Gantheaume, 480
Gower, 95
Grenville, 530

H.
Hamilton, 56, 147
Harrowby, 494, 544, 594, 602
Harvey, 733
Hawkesbury, 60, 123, 218, 329, 407, 434, 444, 518, 542, 783, 824
Henderson, 65
Hobart, 6
Howison, 45, 244, 305, 547, 560, 919
Hume, 462

I. J.
Jefferson, 645
Jordan, 353, 368

K.
Keith, 557, 576, 669
King, 709

L.
Landaff, 679
Lascelles, 117, 220
Laurence, 53, 738
Livingstone, 118
Long, 245
Louis, 18, 182, 188, 325, 428, 430

M.
Mackintosh, 383
Mainwaring, 257, 332
Magens, 725
Meheé de la Touche, 383, 765, 783
Melville, 25, 91, 189, 433, 570
Mildmay, 245
Moira, 828, 860
Montgelas, 27
Moore, 663
Musgrave, 140

N.
Napoleon, 126, 160, 438, 491, 493, 689, 933, 942
Nares, 857
Nelson, 659, 669
Newland, 175
Newport, 48

O.
O'Neil, 664
Osborn, 223

P.
Paley, 117, 191
Parnell, 48, 84, 422
Percival, 56
Pechon, 685
Pitt, 5, 26, 33, 43, 53, 63, 65, 92, 97, 105, 109, 149, 161, 191, 238, 241, 255, 312, 319, 379, 409, 432, 438, 449, 513, 570, 592, 608 609, 737, 796, 814, 829, 865, 900, 929
Puget, 626

R.
Redin, 160
Rose, 99, 162, 164, 166, 190, 311, 411, 521
Rumbold, 764, 782, 820, 889

S.
Schuckburgh, 99, 165
Sheffield, 368
Sheridan, 53
Sinclair, 166, 246, 621
Souchét, 653
Soult, 649
Steinforth, 159
Sweden, King of, 234, 356

T.
Talleyrand, 119, 159, 643, 750, 819, 887, 890
Temple, 59
Thornton, 194, 378, 412, 448
Tierney, 795
Turnbull, 544

V
Vansittart, 71

W.
Wall, 215
Warwick, 221
Watson, 315, 442
Wellesley, 513
Wheatley, 170, 230
Wilberforce, 104, 117, 178, 188, 220, 406, 739, 785, 938
Wilson, 494, 510, 554, 632
Windham, 52, 55, 105, 109, 507, 937

Y.
Yorke, 102, 383

INDEX OF PLACES.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

A.
America, 196, 216, 600, 645, 646, 777, 833
Austria, 254, 319, 405, 424, 593, 930

B.
Baden, 183
Bath, 301, 311
Bentheim, 159
Boulogne, 189, 432, 484, 491, 557, 570, 647, 669
Brazils, 838
Brest, 680

C.
Chester, 704, 731
Constantinople, 223, 482

D.
Demerara, 587, 815
Denmark, 781
Domingo, 32, 124, 135, 353, 404

E.
Ettenheim, 29

F.
France, 87, 126, 202, 360, 385, 410, 447, 488, 493, 642, 685, 690, 750, 752, 760, 819, 888, 890, 930
Franckfort, 689

G.
Good Hope, Cape of, 538
Guadaloupe, 604

H.
Hamburgh, 494, 764, 782
Hanover, 184

I.
Indies, West, 1, 65, 196, 224, 353, 368
Ireland, 46, 63, 121, 137, 140, 196, 215, 321, 467, 623, 629, 664, 665, 673, 705, 711, 716, 735, 745, 801, 816, 900, 906, 947, 951

J.
Jamaica, 1, 65, 79, 80, 124, 133, 353, 368

K.
Kentucky, 647
Knaresborough, 218

L.
Louisiana, 646

M.
Madrid, 36
Malta, 254, 320, 592, 605
Manchester, 191, 218
Martinico, 604
Mexico, 840
Munich, 27, 119, 935

N.
Norwich, 732

P.
Peru, 840
Petersburgh, 30
Portugal, 838
Prussia, 254, 320

R.
Ratisbon, 160, 188, 234
Rotterdam, 642
Russia, 29, 87, 95, 188, 234, 254, 319, 360, 407, 428, 488, 592, 643, 690 750, 752, 760, 777, 890 929

S.
Sardinia, 938
Spain, 36, 511, 544, 595, 660, 670, 748, 777, 786
Stockholm, 538
Stutgard, 644, 775
Sweden, 87, 234, 254, 356, 428, 483

T.
Tenessee, 645
Topningen, 494

V.
Vienna, 424

W.
Warsaw, 182, 325, 430, 471
Warwick, 221
Wirtemburgh, 644, 775